

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-12, 14-24, and 26-30 are pending in this application, Claims 1, 12, 14, 15, 24, and 26 having been currently amended; and Claim 4 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for amended Claims 1, 12, 14, 15, 24, and 26 can be found, for example, in original claims, drawings, and specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14-24, and 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hill et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,981; hereinafter “Hill”); and Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hill in view of Van Berkel (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0190964; hereinafter “Van Berkel”).

In response to the rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14-24, and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hill, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite features formerly of Claim 4. Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 recites novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied reference.

Amended independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing device including, *inter alia*:

...presenting means for presenting by wireless communication user information to be read or changed by said other information processing device, said user information is updated on a basis of a history of use of contents provided from said other information processing device;

specifying means for specifying permission to read or change the user information presented by said presenting means;

identifying means for identifying said other information processing device;

storing means for storing the user information read or changed by said other information processing device identified by said identifying means in association with said other information processing device; and

communicating means for transmitting said user information by quasi-electrostatic field communication, electromagnetic wave communication, or optical communication directly between said information processing device and said other information processing device,

wherein when an initial communication with said other information processing device is performed, information for identifying said information processing device is transmitted to said other information processing device.

Independent Claims 12, 14, 15, 24, and 26-28 recite substantially similar features as Claim 1. Thus, the arguments presented below with respect to Claim 1 are also applicable to independent Claims 12, 14, 15, 24, and 26-28.

Pages 3-4 of the outstanding Office Action, in the rejection of former Claim 4, asserts that Hill describes that “when an initial communication with said other information processing device is performed, information for identifying said information processing device is transmitted to said other information processing device [payment transaction system for validation, column 2, lines 24-40].” Applicants respectfully disagree.

Column 2, lines 24-40 of Hill states:

The present invention provides a digital payment transaction system which offers improved efficiency and security and which is suitable for making micropayments, including very low value payments. This is achieved by issuing to the user a “carnet” or set of digital payment tokens which comprises a set of random numbers in a determined sequence. The numbers in the sequence are completely unrelated to one another, and there is no correlation between the numerical value of a token and its position in the sequence. This is in contrast with prior art proposals in which the tokens are related to one another by cryptographic transforms. The tokens are validated by passing them to the payment server where the token is compared with the corresponding number in the random sequence stored at the

server. In this way, the system offers a high level of cryptographic security, while completely removing the processing overhead from the vendor.

Thus, the above-portion of Hill merely describes that a digital payment transaction system issues to a user a “carnet” or set of digital payment tokens which includes a set of random numbers in a determined sequence. However, Hill does not describe that the carnet or digital payment tokens includes information for *identifying* the digital payment transaction system to the other information processing device to which the carnet or digital payment tokens are transmitted to. Hill also does not describe that the carnet or set of digital payment tokens are transmitted during an *initial communication* with the other information processing device.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1, 12, 14, 15, 24, and 26-28 (and all claims depending thereon) patentably distinguish over Hill.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14-24, and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hill be withdrawn.

In response to the rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hill in view of Van Berkel, Applicants note that Claim 9 is dependent on Claim 1 and is thus believed to be patentable at least for the reasons discussed above. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Van Berkel fails to cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Hill.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hill in view of Van Berkel be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, and in light of the above discussion, the pending claims as presented herewith are believed to be in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/09)

Derek P. Benke
Registration No. 56,944